

# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 243 588

PS 014 290

AUTHOR Porter, John W.  
 TITLE What Has Been Learned about Educational Change and Program Development over the Past Decade That Could Be Helpful in Designing and Implementing New Follow-Through Approaches?  
 SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.  
 PUB DATE Jan 81  
 NOTE 38p.  
 PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)  
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.  
 DESCRIPTORS \*Educational Change; \*Educational History; \*Expectation; Primary Education; Program Development; \*Program Effectiveness; \*Program Improvement  
 IDENTIFIERS \*Project Follow Through

## ABSTRACT

While Follow Through programs over the past 12 years have been committed to meeting the expectations of government officials and other concerned citizens, the program now must document what is expected of the project and how those expectations will be measured. If this major deficiency is not addressed immediately, the program probably will end. Because no study to date has recommended the establishment of national expectations and national criterion-referenced measures, this paper attempts to do so by reviewing the history, describing the present accomplishments, and projecting the future of Project Follow Through. Four questions are addressed: (1) What did citizens expect from Follow Through between 1967 and 1979? (2) What has the program accomplished as of 1980? (3) What can the program hope to accomplish if impediments can be overcome? (4) What recommendations can be offered for designing and implementing new Follow Through approaches? (RH)

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
 \* from the original document. \*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

WHAT HAS BEEN LEARNED ABOUT  
EDUCATIONAL CHANGE AND PROGRAM  
DEVELOPMENT OVER THE PAST DECADE  
THAT COULD BE HELPFUL IN DESIGNING  
AND IMPLEMENTING NEW FOLLOW-THROUGH APPROACHES?

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER

This document has been reproduced as  
received from the person or organization  
originating it.  
Minor changes have been made to improve  
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-  
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE  
position or policy.

by

John W. Porter, President  
Eastern Michigan University

January 15, 1981

Prepared for the  
U.S. Department of Education  
National Institute of Education  
Contracts/Grants Management Division  
1200 19th Street  
Washington, D. C. 20208

ED0243588

PS 014290

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Background Related to the Authorization of Follow-Through	1
II. What were Citizen Expectations for Follow-Through over the past 12 years -- 1967-1979?	6
A. Most Children can Learn	9
B. School Officials Should Establish Expectations	10
C. Teachers Need Better Training	10
D. Educators Protecting Self Interest	13
E. Local Control	13
F. Financing Follow-Through	14
III. What are the Significant Accomplishments of Follow-Through as of the Present-1980?	16
A. Parent Involvement	18
B. Teacher Training On-the-Job	18
C. Model-Sponsorship	19
D. Career Ladders for Para-Professionals	20
E. Integrated Curriculum Sequencing	21
F. University Faculty in Classrooms	21
IV. What are the Potential Successes of Follow-Through if Impediments can be Overcome - 1981-2000?	
A. The Lack of Achievement Standards	23
B. The Absence of Linkages	23
C. Time as a Deterrent to Change	24
D. Input Financing of Schools	25
E. Teaching Staffs	25
F. High Cost of Transfer	26
G. Changing the Value System	26
V. What are Some Recommendations for Designing and Implementing New Follow-Through Approaches	
A. The federal government needs to be more explicit in what is expected	31
B. The federal government needs to give serious consideration to a changed financing	31
C. The higher education enterprise needs to become more involved in program improvement	31
D. The public school staffs of the nation need to become sensitive to the change in values	31
E. The federal government needs to support technological inquiries designed to improve learning in a more cost-effective method	32
Bibliography	33

## I. Background Related to the Authorization of Follow-Through

As a person\* who has continually advocated a direct link between education, employment and entitlement (adequate benefits for retirement), it is a challenge to undertake a scholarly look at the issues of educational change and program development--past, present and future--as associated with Follow-Through.

The reference to the linkage between education and employment, similar to the linkage created by the Social Security Act of 1935 between employment and social security entitlement, is an important addition to educational strategy. It corresponds to the shift within recent years from schooling being an end in itself to being a means to higher ends, one of which is employment. That linkage does not exist in 1980 for minorities and for low-income families except through the process of screening, sorting and selecting. Even with the ultimate in Follow-Through success, the nation will sooner or later have to come to grips with this societal deficiency if children from minority and low-income families are to better succeed within the schooling process, particularly at the secondary level. The incentives do not exist at present.

The fundamental challenge, which is of very recent origin, is whether government (local, state and federal) can provide incentives to bring about equality of educational opportunity, thereby shifting the schooling process from one that screens, sorts and selects to one that provides equality, equity and excellence. The financing of Follow-Through was an attempt to extend the Head-Start Program toward addressing this challenge.

The expectation in this author's mind and in the minds of thousands of parents is not scholarly but is fundamental. Educators must learn how to help minority

---

\*Dr. Porter is President of Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, Michigan, and for ten years (1969-1979) served as Michigan State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

and economically poor children learn to read, write, talk, and compute if such children are to improve their chances for success. The acquisition of the essential skills during the early years is critical to later schooling success and employment in our technological society.

Investigation into the work of the 22 model-sponsors and the 173 local-projects has lead this author to conclude that there has been a general agreement and scholarly commitment toward meeting the expectations of government officials, educators, parents, taxpayers and other concerned citizens. The efforts of the past dozen years should not be lost. However, expectations need to be re-prioritized and supported if solid evidence is to emerge that 'all children, regardless of their color, origin, social class, sex or demographic location, can acquire reasonable expectations after three years of intensive schooling during the primary cycle.'

This investigation, however, did reveal a major deficiency in the National Follow-Through program which, if not addressed immediately, will probably be the "death-knell" of the activity. It is becoming increasingly clear that the federal government needs to invest in documenting what is expected and how it will be measured. In all of the studies undertaken, recommendations that address this major deficiency in terms of the present or future directions of Follow-Through do not emerge. This paper will attempt to frame the past, picture the present, and project an image of the future.

There is only so much learning that can be reasonably expected through effective teaching within the required time of schooling, usually 180 days and 900 hours. Furthermore, most American children are able to acquire the "Intentional School Learnings" which are expected. However, many minority children and children from low-income families have difficulty achieving the Intentional School Learnings, in part because many schools tend to grade on a normal curve, because time is limited, because teachers cannot produce recall, and because of

instructional deficiencies. This fact looms as the most significant finding acquired about educational change and what would be helpful in designing new Follow-Through approaches during the 1980s.

As reported in a recent study,<sup>1</sup> "Educational research is continually plagued with the problem of what criteria to use to measure the effectiveness of instruction," and the result is that every researcher tends to develop his or her own means for expectations and evaluations. The fact that there continues to be much disagreement on the standards and procedures of the National Follow-Through Evaluation as reported in the Harvard Educational Review is evidence of this need.<sup>2</sup>

What seems clear is that no standards were established before the funding of the Follow-Through initiative in 1967, probably because of the historical debate on local control.

There is however, no inherent conflict between the concept of local control of schools and the establishment of national expectations and national criterion-referenced measures to determine if those ~~expectations~~ are being met by children in specialized programs such as Head-Start, Follow-Through and Title I, ESEA. This emerges as probably the most controversial issue to be faced by the National Institute of Education in considering new approaches for Follow-Through. The federal government needs to invest funds in an effort to document what is to be expected and how it is to be measured. This scientific approach toward human growth and development must be implemented for these last two decades of the 20th century.

In an effort to frame the past, it is important to again document that Follow-Through is of recent origin, having begun only 13 years ago. Since 1967,

---

<sup>1</sup>Walter Hodges et al, Follow-Through: Forces for Change in the Primary Schools, Ypsilanti, Michigan: The High Scope Press, 1980, p. 51.

<sup>2</sup>Ernest R. House et al, "Perspectives on the Follow-Through Evaluation," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 43, No. 2, May 1978, p. 192.

the United States Office of Education disbursed over \$500 million to support Follow-Through efforts throughout the United States. This certainly is a sufficient amount of money, if properly applied, to provide some insights into the fundamental challenge which was first raised in the 1950s.

The 22 model-sponsors, 173 local-project directors and 4,000 teachers involved in Follow-Through believe in the success of the program and feel that the maintenance of the concept of the model-sponsor should be continued. These dedicated people also believe that the National Follow-Through Program represents the first real change in the delivery of primary education.

The principal concern of these individuals has been the lack of enthusiastic federal support for the program and the continued threat of termination. Since there seems to be little concrete and verifiable three-year data packaged for general consumption, it is necessary that federal policymakers seek new approaches to answers to the fundamental challenge. How to address the concerns of both groups, the sponsors and funders, and deliver to school officials an acceptable package for implementation is of interest to all involved.

Attempting to respond to the different expectations which have surfaced during the past 10 years about the mission of Follow-Through was a difficult challenge to resolve. It is hoped that by dividing this paper into a review of expectations of the past, a documentation of accomplishments as of the present, a listing of impediments to the future success of the program, and recommendations to help in designing and implementing new approaches, it will be of value to the reader.

Three questions are therefore presented and responded to in order to focus upon the issues of educational change and program development--past, present and future.

- What were citizen expectations for Follow-Through over the past 12 years--1967 to 1979?
- What are the significant accomplishments of Follow-Through as of the present--1980?
- What are the potential successes of Follow-Through in the future if impediments can be overcome--1981 to 2000?
- What are some recommendations for designing and implementing new Follow-Through approaches?

The paper concludes with some thoughts from the author on the new directions in American education as embodied in Follow-Through and suggests rather than a return to the past, a redoubling of effort in the future is the appropriate course to pursue.



## II. What were Citizen Expectations for Follow-Through over the past 12 years--1967-1979?

Follow-Through, funded 13 years after the U.S. Supreme Court decision in Brown v. Topeka and two years after Title I, ESEA, was a program of hope in the minds or at least the subconscious of many citizens, that directly-funded experimental programs of this kind would demonstrate to school personnel that minority children and children from low-income families could benefit from an improved learning environment.

As a result, several states took steps in the early 1970s to establish base-line data in the basic skills of reading and math to gauge the impact of all primary school initiatives in an effort to report to the citizens what worked and what did not work. The State of Michigan was one of the first states to establish criterion-referenced testing at the start of level four (grade 4) to determine whether students who had completed the primary cycle were equipped with basic math and reading skills. To date, no Follow-Through funding has been provided to isolate the impact of the Follow-Through programs in the State of Michigan.

For illustrative purposes, Table I depicts the 1978 test results for the State of Michigan on 130,000 fourth grade students. This data is compared over four years and shows a gradual, but not historic, improvement.

In Michigan, citizens expected that the results of Follow-Through, if successful, might be applied to primary grades in such a way that most of the 35,000 to 40,000 students in the 0 to 74 percent ranges, as shown in Table I, would demonstrate greater acquisition of the basic skills. Fundamental to this, as translated to measures in Michigan, is a relatively straight-forward question:

Table I

PROPORTIONS REPORT 1975-78

FOURTH GRADE  
PERCENT OF PUPILS ATTAINING INDICATED PROPORTIONS OF OBJECTIVES

READING					
YEAR	PROPORTION OF OBJECTIVES ATTAINED				NUMBER OF PUPILS
	.00-.24	.25-.49	.50-.74	.75-1.00	
1978	12.4	9.6	15.6	62.4	134,759
1977	14.0	10.2	15.4	60.5	133,270
1976	18.7	10.6	15.3	55.4	136,858
1975	20.9	11.3	16.4	51.4	140,123

  

MATHEMATICS					
YEAR	PROPORTION OF OBJECTIVES ATTAINED				NUMBER OF PUPILS
	.00-.24	.25-.49	.50-.74	.75-1.00	
1978	3.5	5.8	11.6	79.1	134,759
1977	4.1	6.6	12.5	76.8	133,270
1976	2.3	5.1	13.3	79.3	136,858
1975	2.6	5.6	14.5	77.2	140,123

SEVENTH GRADE  
PERCENT OF PUPILS ATTAINING INDICATED PROPORTIONS OF OBJECTIVES

READING					
YEAR	PROPORTION OF OBJECTIVES ATTAINED				NUMBER OF PUPILS
	.00-.24	.25-.49	.50-.74	.75-1.00	
1978	9.7	10.1	13.0	67.3	139,471
1977	10.5	10.6	13.3	65.7	147,021
1976	20.2	11.9	12.3	55.6	155,632
1975	20.4	11.1	12.0	56.6	158,781

  

MATHEMATICS					
YEAR	PROPORTION OF OBJECTIVES ATTAINED				NUMBER OF PUPILS
	.00-.24	.25-.49	.50-.74	.75-1.00	
1978	8.6	14.8	27.4	49.2	139,471
1977	9.9	15.9	27.6	46.6	147,021
1976	4.9	12.9	29.2	53.0	155,632
1975	5.2	12.3	26.8	55.7	158,781

Proportions Report

This proportions report shows the percent of students attaining certain proportions of the mathematics and reading objectives for the last four years of the objective-referenced testing program. For example, in 1978, 12.4% of the fourth graders attained only 0-24% of the reading objectives and 62.4% of the students attained between 75 and 100% of them.

Source: Eugene T. Paslov, The Status of Basic Skills Attainment in Michigan Public Schools, 1979, Michigan Department of Education, Lansing, Michigan, p. 20.

Can a system be devised that places a "well-trained adult with an aide" in a setting with 25 children, where all of the children are, assuming no major physical or mental handicaps, provided sufficient instruction to acquire what would be reasonable expectations within the primary cycle time allotted?

Although there are a series of corollary questions, this expectation of citizens tends to get lost in the maze of posturings and strategies of proponents and opponents, which is another major reason for questions about the effectiveness of a national Follow-Through program.

What has to take place within the time allotted in regard to a teacher, classroom, school site or school district is at the heart of the issue. All too often, even though the expectations are relatively simple, the "politics of schooling" tend to make solutions next to impossible to accomplish resulting in lowered public confidence ratings.

There are several "citizen expectations" that emerge from a careful screening of the numerous verbalizations about student learning over the past several decades which are still being debated by "educators." These citizen expectations are:

- Most children can learn what is reasonable to expect if properly instructed.
- Schools should set learning expectations that parents can understand and stop screening, sorting and selecting children.
- Teachers need to be better trained by colleges of education or someone else to respond to the needs of minority children and children from low-income families.
- Educators should show that they are more concerned about helping children learn than the time they put in and their salaries.

- School people should stop trying to hide behind the concept of local control in order to avoid facing the realities of today's environment.
- There are sufficient funds being provided to demonstrate whether schools can be effective.

A careful review of these six citizen expectations provides the first evidence of the conflict that exists and probably answers the question, "Can a system be devised . . ." particularly if the system is not cost-effective.

Most Children Can Learn - If those who teach children set time as the major determinant of student learning, as has been past practice, the chances are some children will not learn. If standardized tests are used to measure student learning, it is difficult to establish if children can learn a specific set of skills. For most of the 200 year history of the United States, the assumption was that a number of children would not be able to perform at an acceptable level. Since these children tended to become psychological dropouts by the 6th grade and physical dropouts by the 10th grade to pursue unskilled jobs, school personnel were under little pressure to alter their instructional strategies. Indeed, American public policy sanctioned this process through the use of standardized tests and grading on a curve.

Since 1954, school officials have come under increasing pressure to demonstrate that all children can acquire a specific amount of information and skills. The technological advances of the past quarter of a century, which include television, transistors, computers and a complete change in lifestyles, along with an unprecedented social revolution, have placed greater emphasis upon meeting the needs of minority children and children from low-income families. After 25 years of a new public policy regarding the expectation that school people would



be able to reach and teach all children, the variance between the citizen expectation and the results is less than satisfactory.

School Officials Should Establish Expectations - Those who believe all children can learn also tend to believe that school officials have been somewhat derelict in their responsibility of setting reasonable expectations independent of textbook materials. As with the first citizen expectation, there is a significant difference of opinion about the setting of Intentional School Learnings, which consist of those learnings which can and should be acquired within the 900 hours of required instruction.

The State of Michigan, in response to educator complaints about state testing not being related to what was being taught, became one of the first states to establish reasonable student expectations for all subjects and all grades.<sup>3</sup> Table II depicts the complete set of established Intentional School Learnings.

One of the suppressed variables which seldom surfaces in public is the fact that within the brief 30 years of television that medium has emerged as the national curriculum for the elementary and secondary schools of America, setting the expectations for student learning and performance. One of the major reasons successful Follow-Through programs are not more readily accepted is the lack of an interface with this fact and the labor-intensity of the delivery system to improve instruction related to specific student expectations.

Teachers Need Better Training - One of the major deficiencies in focusing on student learning during the past 25 years has been the assumption that most teachers were prepared to provide quality instruction to a heterogeneous group of children, and, if not, that such dedicated professionals would return to colleges and use

---

<sup>3</sup>Michigan Department of Education, "The Common Goals of Education," Lansing Michigan, 1979, p. 18.

TABLE II

THE INTENTIONAL SCHOOL LEARNINGS

- I. The Michigan Preprimary Developmental Foundations
  - Physical Realm
  - Social Realm
  - Emotional Realm
  - Intellectual Realm
  
- II. The Michigan Elementary/Middle School Essential Skills
  - Communication Skills
  - Health Education Skills
  - Mathematics Skills
  - Music Skills
  - Physical Education Skills
  - Science Skills
  - Social Studies Skills
  - Visual Arts Skills
  - Personal, Interpersonal and Social Understandings Skills
  - Career Development Skills
  
- III. The Michigan Secondary Life Role Competencies
  - Aesthetic and Humanistic Appreciations
  - Civic and Social Responsibility
  - Employability and Occupational Skills
  - Personal and Family Management

Source: Publications from the Michigan Department of Education, Lansing, Michigan.

their own funds to become so equipped. It was also assumed the colleges had the advanced programs to provide the necessary improvements.

There is now a growing amount of evidence that many teachers return to colleges to obtain advanced degrees in areas other than their present field. However, graduate courses do not provide the problem-solving focus for those who desire to improve the skills needed to address the unique socio-milieu of their school building.

It has been only within the last half of the 1970s that states and the federal government entertained the idea of financing professional development of school staffs on a problem-solving basis. This has been a practice in the medical profession and in private industry for many years.

Teachers were not prepared for desegregation in 1954. They were not prepared for improving achievement of children in the lower end of the curve in 1965, they were not prepared for mainstreaming in 1972, and certainly they were not prepared for bilingual children in 1975. The linkage between what citizens expect students to learn in terms of the Intentional School Learnings and the skills of teachers to deliver those expectations is a major void in the Follow-Through history.

Probably the most critical aspect of the teacher preparation issue, which has been addressed by several Follow-Through sponsors such as High-Scope, is teacher training focused upon the Intentional School Learnings which are expected to be accomplished within 900 hours. Too often, in an effort to keep relevant, teachers expand the expectations to include much of what is identified as the Incidental Societal Experiences. Incidental Societal Experiences are acquired normally in the nearly 8000 hours outside the classroom. Teachers who have concentrated on providing students with Incidental Societal Experiences have tended to weaken the instructional system.



Educators Protecting Self Interest - The schooling enterprise is labor-intensified, and the development of collective bargaining in the middle 1960s brought a new set of priorities into the classroom which forced many states to establish minimum requirements for instructional contact. This is another important issue related to Follow-Through. Most planned variation programs propose to do in the same time frame what the regular schools were unable to do, rather than accept the "Catch 22" situation of the regular classroom teacher and attempt to supplement and complement the classroom instruction beyond the required time frame.

In every instructional activity, except in the regular classroom, time on task is accepted as a most important variable to accomplishing a set of goals and objectives. For this reason, it is possible that the expectations of citizens will be responded to in a different context during the decade of the 1980s.

It is conceivable that schools could function for 25 hours a week and Follow-Through programs for 15 additional hours during the same week. There is a need to think in terms of preparing "educationalists" as a response to citizen expectations. The "educationalist" assumes that the child can learn but in a different time frame and through a different medium of instruction, which will necessitate a shifting of the schooling process away from the self-contained classroom to a contractual partnership with parents.

Local Control - The arguments that grew out of the concept of local control have caused the expectations of citizens to fall on deaf ears in too many instances. Many school officials have been fearful of putting forth what is expected and have resisted any kind of nation-wide agreement on threshold learning indicators. This resistance to established standards in the name of local control has created two voids in the schooling process.

First, it has made time, as a control, virtually impossible to overcome. What is little appreciated is the fact that once a lesson is presented in a classroom, no matter how good or bad, that presentation is lost forever; it cannot be recaptured as can the works of Sesame Street and the Electric Company.

Second, it is evident that a reliance on local control makes the availability of alternative delivery systems difficult to develop or to merge within existing delivery systems.

The issue of local control is one of the major weaknesses of Follow-Through since the 22 sponsors and 173 sites did not agree to implement their delivery systems based upon a common set of standards. The lack of common goals and objectives and a possible interfacing of practices is probably the number one weakness that can be attributed to Follow-Through.

#### Financing Follow-Through

The financing of public schools and more specifically the funding of Follow-Through is a sixth critical citizen expectation. Deep down, citizens believe that the schools in general are receiving sufficient funds to meet expectations for the time required, i.e., the back to the basics movement. In over 60 percent of the public schools where the vast number of the students demonstrate acquisition of the "basic expectations," this citizen view is substantiated.

To spend another \$4 billion a year for Title I, ESEA, \$500 million over 10 years for Follow-Through and many millions more for other similar programs without a clearer answer to the vexing public school issues is disturbing to many citizens at all points on the continuum. This is one of the principal reasons why the idea of "school busing" is such a hot debate along with the idea of "school vouchers." Strangely enough to some, but understandable to others, it is the people at the extremes of the continuum who tend to agree on the same new approaches, but for different reasons.

Why can't a person who has 25 fifth graders and a base of \$1,000 guaranteed for their education (i.e., \$25,000) meet the schooling needs of those children, particularly if they are minorities or from low-income families where there is an additional \$250 to \$500 per child resulting in \$6,250 to \$12,500 being available. It has been difficult responding to this citizen view.

School personnel are now caught in the middle of this issue with no solution. If the citizen expectations about Follow-Through are accurate, and if a successful Follow-Through approach is clearly effective, most school officials would not have the means to reorder the existing dollars to install the program because of an already over-burdened, labor-intensified enterprise. The need for an instructional technological breakthrough is essential in this regard.

The citizens expected that the educators, and particularly those in Follow-Through programs who were to receive nearly one-half billion dollars in federal funds, would find solutions to these and several other problems so that their expectations would be realized by the end of the decade of the 1970s. That was not to be. Bringing the Follow-Through delivery system in line with citizen expectations is a number one challenge for the 1980s.

### III. What are the Significant Accomplishments of Follow-Through as of the Present-1980?

Commitment, change and comprehensiveness best describe the actions of those involved in the Follow-Through programs across the country. Model-sponsors are pleased today with the many innovations that originated as a result of the financing of the program and complain openly that the positive outcomes and lessons learned in Follow-Through are obscured by focusing too narrowly on the national evaluation and its philosophical flaws.<sup>4</sup>

In reviewing the history of Follow-Through, a not too publicized revelation emerged which needs to be presented. There are actually two different means by which the idea of a Follow-Through model can be described.

There is among the 22 sponsors and 173 sites, "The Follow-Through Model." This model consists of three components which in theory are expected to exist in all Follow-Through funded programs:

1. Parent Involvement and the P.A.C.
2. A Unique Instructional Component
3. Comprehensive Services, including medical, dental and nutrition.

On the other hand, there are the "Follow-Through Models," such as the "Cognitive-Oriented Curriculum." There are several Follow-Through Models which again make the evaluation of the program difficult and suggest that the expectations and measures need to be known in advance. The importance of this point is that the "Model" by itself is a significant accomplishment and should be studied independent of the "Models" which have been developed to demonstrate the effectiveness of the "Model."

---

<sup>4</sup>Walter Hodges et al, Follow-Through: Forces for Change in the Primary Schools, Ypsilanti, Michigan: The High Scope Press, 1980, p. 3.

As one looks at Follow-Through in 1980, it has not become, as envisioned, a broad-based, community-action program, nor has it been readily accepted as successful by the school enterprise. One of the principle reasons the program has not received more widespread support is due to the planned variation of models. School people have taken a "wait and see" attitude. Another is the lack of a cost-effective plan from the experimental to general practice. School people believe that, even with the successes, the programs cannot be operationalized.

No matter how successful Follow-Through is today, the accomplishments will be difficult to infuse into the labor-intensified schooling enterprise without the development of a new technology that accomplishes the feat. This point is being made not to detract from the accomplishments but to add a dimension of difficulty which must be taken into consideration as we applaud the numerous and significant accomplishments. It is not difficult to pinpoint some of the more significant accomplishments of the program, but the issue is whether they will be embraced by the "educators." Accomplishments include:

- Parent involvement from a partnership to classroom participation has been a trademark of Follow-Through.
- On-the-Job teacher training in contrast to the typical University pre-service and in-service training of teachers.
- Establishment of career leader models to encourage parents and para-professionals to acquire professional training while accumulating on-the-job experience.
- Development of the model-sponsorship as a support to local staffs for educational change and program development.
- Integrated curriculum sequenced to be used over the full three-year period of the primary cycle rather than designed as an isolated subject or "pull-out" of 20 to 30 minutes per day.

---University faculty representing model-sponsors exposed to the realities and difficulties of educational change and program development in the socio-milieu of a school site resulting in more realistic pre-service programs.

Parent Involvement - During the past 13 years, Follow-Through has demonstrated that low-income parents do indeed care about their children's success in school and will take part in school activities. Requiring parents to become involved in their children's schooling is a first step toward a universal system of contracting with parents on the respective roles of parents, taxpayers and educators.

"Model-sponsors have considered parent involvement essential to the successful implementation of their models and to the effective education of children. Parents have brought unique skills to the implementation process and, through involvement in their children's education, have become strong advocates of Follow-Through."<sup>5</sup>

This parent involvement was a significant force in lobbying for the continuation of Follow-Through several years ago. It could be the forerunner to a uniquely new alignment where parents are presented, in advance of instruction, with what is specifically expected to be accomplished, and showing how the parents can be beneficial on a short time frame and be involved beyond the required time in helping their children acquire expectations.

Teacher Training On-the-Job - Another significant accomplishment of Follow-Through is the staff development and teacher training activities undertaken by several model-sponsors even though they were not University-based. "Training needs

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibid, Follow-Through: Forces for Change in the Primary Schools, p. 19.

were identified by comparing actual teacher training performance in the classroom with the standards of the model being implemented."<sup>6</sup> In this way, in-service training became a continuous process, resulting in the skills and knowledge needed being classified in relationship to the necessary student learnings.

One of the weaknesses with some model-sponsor programs is that when they are not University-based, the potential for the successes to be incorporated into the pre-service and in-service modules of the teacher training programs on a problem-solving basis, rather than on a credit-course basis, is frequently lost.

Although the teacher on-the-job training approach has significant potential, there have been relatively few major discussions in regard to the involvement of University teacher trainers in understanding the value of this approach. Much more needs to be done to document teacher training accomplishments using Follow-Through model-sponsor approaches, and their transfer to University faculties.

Model-Sponsorship - The development of the model-sponsor concept may in the long run become the most successful accomplishment of the Follow-Through program. In theory and in practice the model-sponsor has a proven product to be used and the expertise to support a local school site to implement the model. This is a significant feature of Follow-Through because of what has been called the "Politics of Schooling." Whether a model-sponsor is more successful if it is part of the educational establishment is a question that also has not been determined. It is known however, that school people are basically suspicious of any models which are designed to accomplish a task that the schools have failed to achieve. However, the third party concept (i.e., the student, the teacher and the sponsor) brings to the instructional setting an objective balance for educational change and program development.

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid, Follow-Through: Forces for Change in the Primary School, p. 17.

Whether each of the 1300 teacher training institutions in the United States should be challenged to become model-sponsors as part of the preparation process and working with area schools is an issue which needs to be considered as a next-step development in the 1980s. Another feature of the model-sponsor success is the development of outstanding staff members who work on a regular basis with school-site personnel. The argument between theory and practice is continually tested through this approach which points a direction for higher education in a period of declining enrollments.

Career Ladders for Para-Professionals - In the first set of pronouncements that came forth from the funding of Title I, ESEA, were encouragements to hire para-professionals because of the need to lower adult/pupil ratios. It was also believed to be a good public approach, and many parents were hired. The only problem with these two beliefs was the lack of specific training models and state certification standards.

Although not generally reported in the literature, several model-sponsors developed specific para-professional training models which could become career ladder approaches to be used by school districts and teacher training institutions to produce a work force to compliment the professional teacher.

Model-sponsors discovered that many of the activities performed by teachers were not related to instruction and that in any one hour period nearly half of the time was taken up performing non-instructional tasks. Specifying the non-instructional tasks and training personnel to perform those tasks as a first-step in the state certification process could be a unique means of responding to the labor-intensity of the classroom.

Such specifications do not exist at present. With para-professionals in urban centers attempting to unionize, the potential of using para-professionals in a career ladder way as envisioned by some model-sponsors might be lost to



the "politics of schooling," which would be an unfortunate turn of events. "Why not a training package that uses all parents as para-professionals?"

Integrated Curriculum Sequencing - One of the major problems confronting most classrooms in America today is textbook-driven instruction in isolation of a collective set of reasonable learnings. For many years, some have made the point that if a principal were to request the teachers of several subjects at the same grade or for an instructional cycle, such as the primary cycle, to write out what they expected, their combined list would require two to three times the 900 hours of annual instruction. This is one of the major problems schools have in providing better instruction for children from low-income families and slower-performing minority students.

The development of integrated curriculum sequencing is a major accomplishment which can be attributed to the financing of Follow-Through. By having a comprehensive curriculum with the required time, the student who attains the Intentional School Learnings can be encouraged to accelerate, while the student who has difficulty can be provided an extended daily, weekly, monthly or yearly program. This approach is in contrast to the regular classroom compensatory education approach, which sometimes assumes that the remedial work is to replace classroom instruction rather than to augment it. The integrated curriculum is a major development that has significant implications for all classroom instruction.

University Faculty in Classrooms - It is one thing for the teacher trainer to advise the practice-teacher who is supervised by a master-teacher in order to acquire the necessary credits. It is another thing to have the faculty of the university agree to become involved in the daily activities of the classroom. One of the significant accomplishments of Follow-Through is the involvement of university faculty in the socio-milieu of the teacher-learner process. This development has

long-range implications for the redesign of teacher training programs, particularly in a period of declining enrollments among ~~those~~ students who traditionally perform at acceptable levels in the lock-stepped time frame of many classrooms.

There are a number of scholars who are convinced that any major movement toward equality, equity, and excellence in the schools will require a series of incentives that bring sizable numbers of school officials and faculty together in support of significant changes in the schooling process. Too many of the successes of Follow-Through are currently outside of the establishment and no recognizable efforts seem to be underway to bring those successes into the mainstream of the preparation, teaching and professional development sequence.

The policymakers and funding officials for Follow-Through recognize that significant accomplishments have been achieved in a number of areas and certainly more than the six highlights on this paper, but the problem is that the accomplishments cannot be translated into a national policy proposal in 1980. How to get these significant accomplishments adopted across the nation is a major next step which will require enlightened pursuit during the 1980s.

#### IV. What are the Potential Successes of Follow-Through if Impediments can be Overcome - 1981-2000?

The success of any experimental program is whether or not it can be adopted by the majority as common practice. During the past three decades there have been significant experimental breakthroughs that have become common practices among the masses, primarily due to technological advances.

One of the major impediments to Follow-Through is its development outside the "Politics of Schooling" and the continuing resistance to alterations in regular programs to adopt the successful practices. "The resistance to outside intervention factors is complex. Moving a hothouse plant-raised model into the open field has proven to be more difficult than imagined."<sup>7</sup> Part of the difficulty is the lack of a School-Based Assistance Team that clears the underbrush in order for experimentation to flourish. It may well be that to date there has been no successful hothouse-plant; therefore, the ability to flourish in the open field would naturally be diminished by the inclement weather even if a drought did not occur. In essence, it takes a very healthy house-plant to survive, just as it will take a well-developed Follow-Through Model to overcome the impediments embodied in the politics of schooling. The impediments to the success of such a well-developed model are generally known by those outside the establishment and by the "educators." These impediments to success are:

- The absence of any standards by which models can be evaluated against non-Follow-Through efforts.
- The lack of linkage between expectations, textbooks, tests, and report cards sent home.

---

<sup>7</sup>Follow Through: Forces for Change in the Primary Schools, p. 73.



- The resistance to change which requires abandonment of the system because of time constraints.
- The financing of public schools which places emphasis on inputs rather than outputs.
- The qualifications of teaching staffs who function as "educators" rather than as "educationalists."
- The high cost of experimentation without a corresponding technology to lower costs to where new models are competitive.
- The sameness of delivery systems and the differences in expectations resulting in a high degree of uniformity in process and variance in product, a value system that must change.

The Lack of Achievement Standards - The biggest impediment to successfully putting Follow-Through programs into the mainstream is the lack of standards by which all programs can be evaluated. A major problem in education is the vast amount of discretion provided to each individual to determine what is good and what is acceptable. Even in the highest level professions, the standards and criteria for judging are common. If the accomplishments of the past decade are to be given credibility, the Follow-Through office will have to come to grips with published standards and how those standards will be measured, and then send out a request for proposals. This single step could do much to tighten up the current program and stimulate new approaches toward success. With the development of standards, the cost variables can be evaluated and the impact of the process becomes identifiable.

The Absence of Linkages - Even if the U.S. Department of Education's Follow-Through Office could overcome the impediment of "no standards," there would be the equally

challenging obstacle of linkage. There are basically four major segments to the schooling process: What is to be taught? How is it to be taught? How is it to be measured? and, What is to be sent home? These four segments of the schooling process are currently not linked in most schools. Any new approaches to Follow-Through need to establish as a pre-condition to applying for funding that such linkage is completed and published. The fact that this will be resisted gets to the heart of the crisis of confidence and is a major reason teachers are in a "Catch 22" situation. It is also a major reason teacher training institutions are not more effective. Such linkage would immediately establish four specific areas for teacher retraining and bring about a possible revitalization of teacher education programs.

Time as a Deterrent to Change - Time is the prevailing indicator of success in today's schools. There are few, if any, school facilities in operation where the principal and staff conclude on Friday afternoon that the established expectations for the week were not met by a number of children, therefore school will reconvene for all day on Saturday and/or Sunday. This may sound out of the question, but so did placing a man on the moon in the 1950s. There needs to be a shift away from time-centered instruction to child-centered instruction if Follow-Through is to become an acceptable mode of operation in the upcoming decades. The only way to do this is to break out of the minimum time requirements imposed by the states.

Consistent with this train of thought is the prevailing view that special instruction is a replacement rather than an additive. It is conceivable that the greatest impact upon the primary cycle could be the redirection of all Title I, ESEA funds to a time other than regular school hours with a federal requirement that, to be eligible, each child must receive full instruction during the school

day and total year. In other words, all Follow-Through or Title I activities could be provided beyond the 900 hours of required instruction by a school staff different than those who have already put in a full work schedule unless the school can show acceptable improvement within the regular time required.

Input Financing of Schools - The suggestion of a shift in the funding of special programs designed to accomplish a basic mission is one means of removing the impediments of financing inputs. A major problem in the schools today is the reward system which tends to perpetuate the status quo. Because of union contracts and other limitations, teachers are provided no recognized incentives for excelling beyond the call of duty when it comes to reaching those who have the most difficulty in the classroom. This is a major reason teachers prefer to grade on a curve and avoid making the expectations public before instruction. Accountability, when one cannot control the environment for which one is to be held accountable, is a very frightening experience. In some way, the financing of school programs must be changed to allow successful practices to flourish and be adopted. It is likely that such successes can flourish if they are transferred into a balanced curriculum where time and funds are related.

Teaching Staffs - Many teachers sincerely believe that some children will never make it and they usually operate in such a way to prove the proposition. There does not seem to be any validated information that would remove this impediment from the schooling process. Tests have been devised to measure student progress, and even beginning teacher competency tests have been devised for state certification. Maybe an indicator test in regard to one's perception of whether children can learn needs to be developed.

In the period of the expanding enrollments, colleges of education recommended certification for sufficient numbers to fill classrooms at the prevailing ratios. Unfortunately, this expansion was taking place simultaneously with technological advances and social change. These conditions now make it imperative to retool the teaching force of America if the successes of Follow-Through and other programs are to be given any chance of infusion on a broad basis. All people in the schooling business should want to become "educationalists" if the concept of public education is to keep pace with the rapidly changing technological times.

High Cost of Transfer - One of the greatest impediments to successful experiments being adopted by schools is the cost involved in placing such programs in the operating setting. Most Follow-Through programs are more costly than the regular classrooms. It is possible that, through categorical funding, such funds could be redirected to allow for adoption of successful Follow-Through experimental programs; but, in most instances, such funds are so entangled in regulations and the "politics of schooling" that the possibility of utilizing such funds for change are discouraged. The reordering of the funding of categoricals could be a powerful influence to overcome a major impediment to putting successful practices into regular settings. In addition, one of the major weaknesses in education is the lack of funding support to determine if the various funded experiments are realistic for adoption. A technological breakthrough needs to be pursued by the National Institute of Education as the most pressing need in the 1980s to achieve the goals of Follow-Through.

Changing the Value System - Current American values concerning education have brought about delivery systems and credentialling standards that are more alike than different. In contrast, those who teach and administer programs tend to have



values that allow for great differences in expectations depending upon who the children happen to be. This dichotomy, where the standards all over the country are almost identical in terms of teachers, administrators, textbooks, facilities, buses, food, time allotted and vacation periods, while the results as measured by most standardized tests show considerable variance, is a serious indictment. Our present value system supports these kinds of results and will need to change by 180 degrees to accomplish the goals of Follow-Through.

It is ironic that we expect children to accomplish certain expectations, even though the systems are so identical, but the children vary considerably from one district to another, and from one building to another. This is one of the principal reasons why school busing for desegregation purposes has had so much difficulty being accepted. The principles of Follow-Through are significant and with the right change in our schooling value system, important accomplishments can be achieved.

Actions that would neutralize many of these impediments must become high priority items if millions of dollars are going to continue to be allocated to programs such as Follow-Through. A carefully developed strategy, taking into consideration each impediment, needs to be devised as one of the first new approaches for Follow-Through. Such new approaches need to recognize and incorporate the accomplishments already made by Follow-Through if successes are to emerge in the 1980s.

## V. What are Some Recommendations for Designing and Implementing New Follow-Through Approaches

As noted at the beginning of this paper, a different look at Follow-Through over the past 12 years would have been to review major educational changes, program developments and identify major lessons learned. This approach was not taken because it tends to avoid the gritty politics of schooling. However, a summary of the areas of educational change and program development are identified below and are probably far more prevalent than the readiness of most schools to adopt them. Indeed we have learned a great deal over the past dozen years that can be helpful toward designing and implementing new Follow-Through approaches.

I shall review what have been the major educational changes since 1967 . . .

1. Published Intentional School Learnings.
2. Criterion-referenced tests that report pupil progress to parents.
3. Public reporting of test results in the newspapers.
4. Creation of alternatives for teacher training and support of teacher on-the-job training.
5. University faculty in the classrooms of the school sites daily trying to overcome the difficulties of the socio-milieu.
6. Mainstreaming of handicapped and bilingual children into regular classrooms.
7. Commitments by the federal government to educate minority children and children from low-income families to a level of acceptability to school personnel and parents.

The following is a review of the major program developments since 1967 . . .

1. Creation of the model-sponsor as a support system.
2. Establishment of the partnership between the parent and school with parents assuming some instructional responsibilities.

3. Development of the comprehensive full-day programs sequenced over the entire span of the primary cycle.
4. Various successful primary-cycle educational alternatives generated with different philosophical and theoretical orientations.
5. Cadres of uniquely trained people who can use their knowledge to influence change.
6. Linkage between theory, research and practice in staff development.

Finally, the major lessons learned since 1967 which have not been solved to enable Follow-Through's educational changes and program developments to be adopted are the following:

1. Local school districts do not have the internal mechanisms to support change the magnitude of Follow-Through.
2. Local school personnel perceive external persons as a threat to their own integrity.
3. Educational research is continually plagued with the problem of what criteria to use to measure the effectiveness of instruction.
4. High costs of experimental programs reduce their credibility for infusion into regular classrooms and require a technological breakthrough.
5. Specification of what can be reasonably expected as "Intentional School Learnings" within the time allotted does not exist.
6. "Politics of schooling" are more difficult to overcome than many people could appreciate or understand earlier.

The citizen expectations for Follow-Through: (1) most children can learn, (2) school officials should establish expectations, (3) teachers need better training, (4) educators protecting self interests, (5) local control, and (6) financing of Follow-Through, seem to be more straight-forward than the elaborate models that have been established as part of the Follow-Through Planned Variation experiment.

Can a system be devised that places a "well-trained adult with an aide" in a setting with 25 children, where all of the children are, assuming no major physical or mental handicaps, provided sufficient instruction to acquire what would be reasonable expectations within the primary cycle time allotted? This is a straightforward question asked by citizens. As noted, this question is not addressed as a significant accomplishment and remains the primary concern of interested parties.

The significant accomplishments of Follow-Through tend to be in areas not related to citizen expectations, which may be a barrier to support of the continuation of the program. The accomplishments, which include (1) parent involvement, (2) on-the-job teacher training, (3) career ladders for para-professionals, (4) model-sponsorship, (5) integrated curriculum sequencing, and (6) university faculty in classrooms, are valuable contributions to the literature and to the potential of improving student learning and performance. However, to date they have not proven that their impact makes a significant difference. This is partly because the accomplishments do not address what the citizens envision as being critical.

The impediments that stand in the way of successful adoption of Follow-Through models are numerous and involved, but they are not impossible to overcome. The impediments include: (1) the lack of achievement standards, (2) absence of linkages between expectations and tests, (3) time as a deterrent to change, (4) financing of schools, (5) appropriate training of staffs, (6) high cost of transfer, and (7) reticence to change the value system. These impediments are gate-keepers to the adoption of Follow-Through models as educational change strategies and new program development alternatives and cannot be ignored by the policymakers and funders of Follow-Through.

In summary, it seems that there are several necessary recommendations if the results of the decade of the 1970s are to be a part of the new approaches of the 1980s.

First, the federal government needs to be more explicit on what it hopes will be the student outcomes. Once outcomes at the threshold have been established, model-sponsors must be required to link the outcomes to their systems, adopt common measurements that are sensitive to minority and disadvantaged children, and reach consensus on a standard reporting system to parents before any funds are allocated. This step would go a long way in eliminating the first two impediments, i.e., the lack of achievement standards and absence of linkages.

Second, the federal government needs to give serious consideration to a possible change in the financing of targeted programs so that they are positioned to support educational change and program development rather than become substitutes for maintenance of the regular school day. This action would address impediments three and four, i.e., time as a deterrent and financing duplication.

Third, the vast array of human resources in the declining higher education enterprise of teacher training needs to be provided an incentive to become actively involved on an institutional basis in educational change and program development, including the retooling of faculty and participation in local school site activities. The fifth impediment, a lack of appropriate teacher preparation and in-service training, could be overcome by this action.

Fourth, the enormous teaching force, including principals and others, needs to be subjected to a sensitivity test in terms of the prevailing requirements of teaching as compared to what was required upon completion of undergraduate training. The unprecedented technological advances and social changes in the country in less than 30 years require a heightened readiness for professional retooling. This recommendation is designed to eliminate or greatly reduce the impediment regarding the reticence to change the schooling value system.

Fifth, the funding of technological strategies to make educational change and program development more fiscally acceptable is a major challenge for new approaches. In all production areas except for the labor-intensified enterprise of schooling, technology has reduced per-unit cost, thereby providing a strong incentive for adoption. This same effort needs to become a funding priority of the federal government if successful practices such as Follow-Through are to be infused into the regular classrooms. This final recommendation is to encourage a closer relationship between experimentation and transfer of high cost programs.

The country has started down a new schooling road embodied in the principles of the "Follow-Through Model." It is a schooling road that goes in a different direction than the one travelled for so long that sanctioned a system that screened, sorted, and selected the talented few. It is a schooling road toward equality, equity, and excellence. Let us not be overcome by the many obstacles that this turn in direction has created.

It would be so easy for "educators" to return to the simpler way and retreat to the standards of the past, but so unfair to the millions who visualize the schools as their only real hope of being a part of Main Street, U.S.A. The National Follow-Through Planned Variation Study and all of its successful educational changes, program developments, and service activities have raised new hopes and have begun to come to grips with many of the hard-to-answer educational questions.

I for one support the principles embodied in the Follow-Through Model and believe that with some changes consistent with the five recommendations presented, this could provide the new approaches for Follow-Through in the decade of the 1980s and achieve the desired goals.

Let us continue to push forward in support of this new direction toward an ultimate success even if we have discovered that this task is more difficult than originally envisioned.

REFERENCES

- Becker, Wesley C., "The National Evaluation of Follow Through," Education and Urban Society, Vol. 10, No. 4, August, 1978, pp. 431-458.
- Elardo, Richard, "Project Follow Through: Past, Present, and Future," Day Care and Early Education, Winter, 1978, pp. 40-41.
- Guthrie, John T., "Follow Through: A Compensatory Education Experiment," The Reading Teacher, November, 1977, pp. 240-244.
- Hodges, Walter, et al., Follow-Through: Forces for Change in the Primary Schools, The High Scope Press, Ypsilanti, Michigan, 1980, p. 91.
- Hodges, Walter L. and Robert Sheehan, "Follow Through as Ten Years of Experimentation," Young Children, November, 1978, pp. 4-14.
- House, Ernest R., et al., "Perspectives on the Follow-Through Evaluation," Harvard Education Review, Vol. 48, No. 2, May 1978, pp. 128-160.
- Kennedy, Mary M., "The Follow Through Program," Curriculum Inquiry, 1977, pp. 183-208.
- Kennedy, Mary M., "Findings From the Follow Through Planned Variation Study," Educational Researcher, June 1978, pp. 3-11.
- Love, John M., et al., A Process Evaluation of Project Developmental Continuity: Final Report of the PDC Feasibility Study, 1974-1977, The High Scope Press, Ypsilanti, Michigan, April, 1978, p. 64.
- McLaughlin, T. F., et al., "The Effects of the Behavior Analysis Model of Follow Through to Increase Native American Involvement in the Classroom Educational Process," College Student Journal, Spring, 1980, pp. 46-47.
- Moore, Shirley G., "The Abt Report of Follow Through: Critique and Comment," Young Children, September, 1978, pp. 52-56.
- Office of Education, Follow Through: Promising Approaches to Early Childhood Education, Superintendent of Documents, Washington D.C., 1971, p. 26.
- Paslov, Eugene T., The Status of Basic Skills Attainment in Michigan Public Schools, 1979, Michigan Department of Education, Lansing, Michigan, p. 20.
- Rayder, Nicolas, et al., "Assessing Follow Through: Changes in Intelligence Test Scores over Two and Three Years of Experience in the Responsive Programs," Journal of Experimental Education, Fall, 1978, pp. 60-66.
- Richburg, James A., "Dual Jurisdiction and Political Conflict: A Case of the Choctaw Follow Through," Journal of Research and Development in Education, Vol. 9, No. 4, 1976, pp. 91-101.
- Runkel, Phillip E., The Common Goals of Michigan Education, May, 1980, Michigan Department of Education, Lansing, Michigan p. 18.

Stallings, Jane A., "How Instructional Processes Relate to Child Outcomes in a National Study of Follow Through," Journal of Teacher Education, Spring, 1976, Vol. XXVIII, No. 1, pp. 43-47.

Weikart, D. P., "The Follow Through Planned Variation Experiment: A Discussion," Paper presented at the American Education Research Association meeting, April, 1977, New York.

Weikart, D. P., "Relationship of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning in Preschool Education," In Preschool Programs for the Disadvantaged, ed. J. C. Stanley, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland, 1972.

Weikart, D. P., "Preschool Intervention for the Disadvantaged Child: A Challenge for Special Education," In Children with Special Needs: Early Development and Education, ed. H. H. Spicker, N. J. Anastasiow, and W. L. Hodges, University of Minnesota, Leadership Training Institute/Special Education, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1976.

Weikart, D. P., and B. A. Banet, "Model Design Problems in Follow Through," In Planned Variation in Education: Should We Give Up or Try Harder? ed. A. M. Rivlin and R. M. Timpane, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1975.



